

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE
10

11
12 COUNTRY PREFERRED INSURANCE
13 COMPANY, an Illinois corporation,

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 ROBERT HURLESS and HEATHER
17 HURLESS, husband and wife, and the marital
18 community composed thereof,

19 Defendants.
20

CASE NO. C11-1349RSM

ORDER ON PENDING MOTIONS

21 The Court, having reviewed the file in this matter, does now find and ORDER:

22 (1) On July 5, 2012, defendants filed a motion for reconsideration, to which the Court directed a
23 response. Dkt. ## 44, 50. While the motion has been pending, the parties have filed a number of
24 motions and documents which are improper under the Local Rules of this Court. Among these are the
25 parties' Rule 26(a)(2)(B) expert witness disclosures and attached reports, filed at Dkt. ## 57, 58, 63, 64,
26 and 65. Pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P., expert witness disclosures and reports are to be exchanged between
27 the parties only, with the timing governed by the Court's Scheduling Order. They are not to be filed
28 with the Court, unless they are attached to a declaration in support of or opposition to a motion. The

ORDER - 1

1 Court will accordingly disregard these disclosures.

2 (2) This determination renders defendants' motion to strike the expert report of Danette K.
3 Leonardi (Dkt. # 59) moot. The Clerk shall STRIKE this motion (Dkt. # 59) from the Court's calendar,
4 and the Court shall not consider the expert report in conjunction with any motion or memorandum in
5 opposition to a motion.

6 (3) Plaintiff has moved to strike character witnesses identified by defendants in the course of
7 disclosures as witnesses who could testify to the reputation and "work ethic" of their former attorney,
8 who is now deceased. Dkt. # 71. Plaintiff argues that these character witnesses should be excluded
9 because their proposed testimony is inadmissible and not relevant to the issues in this case, and it should
10 not have to go to the expense of deposing them. *Id.*, pp. 1-2.

11 Although this motion is in the nature of a motion in limine and therefore governed by Local Rule
12 CR 7(d)(4), the Court shall rule on it at this time in the interest of economy. The Court agrees with
13 plaintiff that the proposed testimony of these character witnesses is not relevant and inadmissible,
14 whether under FRE 406 or otherwise. Plaintiff's motion to exclude these character witnesses (Dkt. #
15 71) is accordingly GRANTED.

16 DATED this 18 day of September 2012.

17 

18 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27